

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12-23 and rejected same. With this paper some claims are canceled and new claims 24-26 are added to the application so that claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13-15, and 20-21 and 24-28 are now pending.

Claim Rejections 35 USC Sec. 101

At paragraph 16 of the Office Action, the Office maintains its rejections of claims 1, 3, 18 and 19 under 35 USC Sec. 101. With this paper, of the so-rejected claims only claim 1 is now pending. The Office complains that claim 1 recites a "system claim limitations." With this paper, claim 1 is changed in a way believed to make plain that a list of actions is recited, not a list of elements. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §101 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections 35 USC Sec. 112, Second Paragraph

At paragraph 21 of the Office Action, the Office maintains its rejections of claims 1, 3, 10 & 12 under 35 USC section 112, second paragraph. Of the so-rejected claims, only claims 1 and 10 are now pending.

With this paper claim 1 has been changed in various ways so as to address all the concerns raised by the Examiner.

As to claim 10, which refers to claim 4, the Office asserts the claims are insufficiently clear as to whether the claims are independent system claims or dependent claims further limiting their parent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter being claimed in claim 10 is encompassed in its entirety by the subject matter set out in claim 4, but claim 4 includes additional limitations, and thus claim 10 must be said

to recite "a further limitation of the subject matter claimed," as required by 35 USC 112, fourth paragraph.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections 35 USC §102

At paragraph 29 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 15-16, 20 & 22 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat. 5,544,322 (hereinafter Cheng).

Of these, only claims 1, 4, 13, 15 and 20 are (now) independent, and the others depend from one or another of these claims.

With this paper, all independent claims directed to an authentication network element (including claims to a method for use by same), namely claims 1, 4 and 15, require transmitting to a terminal requesting authentication a reauthentication identity including a unique realm name uniquely identifying an authentication server; receiving a request for reauthentication from another terminal, the request for reauthentication including another reauthentication identity including another unique realm name uniquely identifying another authentication server; and routing the reauthentication request according to the unique realm name included in the request for reauthentication. As indicated by new claims 24-26, an authentication network element can be an authentication server, a proxy, or a service access point for authentication, i.e. an adjunct device. Support for the recited "routing" is e.g. at page 11, line 6.

Also with this paper, and corresponding to the changes made to claims 1, 4 and 15, all independent claims directed to a terminal, namely claims 13, 20 and (new claim) 27 all require

receiving from a first authentication server a reauthentication identity generated during a first authentication, the reauthentication identity including a realm name uniquely indicating the first authentication server; and transmitting to an authentication network element a request for reauthentication using the reauthentication identity including the unique realm name.

In respect to the authentication network element claims, applicant respectfully submits that Cheng does not disclose, among other limitations, the recited routing based on the unique realm name. The Office has relied on Limisco (US Pat. No. 6,662,228) as teaching a related limitation, previously recited in claim 18, namely "preparing a message for forwarding the request for reauthentication to the authentication server indicated by the unique realm name," relying on col. 6, lines 12-27.

As the character string disclosed by Limsico at Col. 7 lines 12-27 (construed by the Office to be indistinguishable from the claimed reauthentication identity) is not generated by an authentication server in a first authentication, but is instead an inherent property of the terminal, claim 18 cannot fairly be said to read upon the applied reference. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion of routing a request for reauthentication based on a reauthentication identity, as required by all the independent authentication network element claims as here amended.

In respect to the terminal claims, applicant respectfully submits that Cheng does not disclose, among other limitations, the recited transmitting to an authentication network element a request for reauthentication using the reauthentication identity including the unique realm name received upon a first

authentication. The Office asserts that Cheng teaches this at col. 5, lines 43-52, arguing that the "authentication library reads on 'authentication network element.'" The cited text is:

Application request VI is sent from client II to application server I. A typical application request VI will include authentication certificate V, particularly pertaining to client II, so as to authenticate client II to application server I.

Authentication libraries VII are each a set of application programming interfaces and their implementations which facilitate the communication between client II and authentication server III, and the communication between client II and application server I. The Kerberos library from project Athena of M.I.T. (please refer to the Kerberos Network Authentication Service (V5) reference noted above) is an example of authentication library VII.

Applicant respectfully submits that "application request VI," which applicant apprehends is asserted by the Office as corresponding to a reauthentication request, is in fact not a reauthentication request, nor an authentication request in any respect. Cheng uses the term "authentication request" to refer to same, and not "application request." See col. 5, line 31, where Cheng explains that "Authentication request IV is a request sent from a principal, such as client II, to authentication server III." [Emphasis added.]

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that all rejections under 35 USC §102 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections 35 USC §103

All rejections under 35 USC section 103 are now moot, because of applicant having canceled all claims so rejected.

New Claims

New claims 24-26 rely for support on page 11, lines 5-6.

New claims 27-28 recite limitations corresponding to those of claims 15-16 and are believed allowable for the same reasons given above as these claims.

New claim 29 depends from claim 27, and so is believed allowable for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited.

04 February 2008

Date

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

Respectfully submitted,

/James A. Retter/

James A. Retter

Registration No. 41,266

tel: (203) 261-1234

Cust. No.: 004955